

Build-Up in Vietnam

Passenger Transport Describes Urban Transport Research Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 15, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the July 16, 1965, edition of Passenger Transport carries an article on legislation (H.R. 9200) I have introduced to establish a 2-year, \$20 million federally supported research program to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new urban transportation systems.

Ten other Members have joined as co-sponsors: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANICK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE REUSS PROPOSES TRANSIT RESEARCH BILL—URGES 2-YEAR \$20 MILLION PLAN FOR TECHNOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGH

WASHINGTON.—A proposal to establish a Federal research program designed to achieve a "technological breakthrough" in the development of new urban transportation systems was presented recently by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin.

Representative REUSS' proposal was originally introduced as a bill—H.R. 9200—on June 17, sponsored by Mr. REUSS and eight other big-city Democratic Congressmen.

Upon introducing the bill, Representative REUSS made a statement on the floor of the House explaining the plan, which calls for amending the 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act to provide \$10 million in fiscal 1966 and an additional \$10 million in fiscal 1967 for conducting and providing for the proposed "additional technological research" toward betterment of transit.

H.R. 9200 subsequently was referred to the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, since the legislation would amend the 1964 transit aid law. Representative REUSS told Passenger Transport that the committee has requested reports from the appropriate agencies, and "until those reports are forthcoming, it is doubtful that it will take any further action."

In the meantime, however, when the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce resumed hearings the week of June 28 on H.R. 5863—the northeast corridor high-speed ground rail transportation bill—Congressman REUSS offered an amendment incorporating the intent of H.R. 9200. He made a statement before the Subcommittee on June 29.

The amendment, in effect, said that any research program undertaken by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to H.R. 5863 should be devoted to the problems of intracity transport as well as to intercity transport. It further stipulated that funds appropriated for this research should be divided equally between the two.

H.R. 9200 proposes amending the 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act so as to in-

clude: "In addition to projects undertaken under subsection (a) the (HHA) Administrator shall undertake a program of research designed to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new kinds of public intraurban transportation systems which can transport persons in metropolitan areas from place to place within such areas quickly, safely, and economically, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to meet the real needs of the people and at the same time contribute to good city planning. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this subsection (c) \$10 million for the fiscal year 1966, and \$10 million for the fiscal year 1967. Any amount so appropriated shall remain available until expended; and any amount authorized but not appropriated for any fiscal year may be appropriated for any succeeding year."

Ill-Advised Partisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, July 20, 1965]

ILL-ADVISED PARTISANSHIP

At a time when he is depending more and more upon Republicans for support of his foreign policy, President Johnson, it seems to us, could not afford the unbecomingly partisan tone that dominated his declaration rejoicing over the passage of the voting rights bill in the House.

Mr. Johnson combined his congratulatory words with a condemnation of the House Republican leadership, which had submitted an alternative voting rights bill. This Republican measure, the President contended, "would have seriously damaged and diluted the guarantee of the right to vote for all Americans"—an assertion that is subject to serious challenge.

But Mr. Johnson went on to hail the final House approval of the administration bill as "a victory for the American Negro and the Democratic Party."

The implication is that the vote went strictly along party lines. The truth of the matter is that congressional Republicans have consistently given the administration better support on civil rights legislation than congressional Democrats. Indeed, the administration's voting rights bill was even drafted in the office of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, the Republican Senate leader, who was one of its most effective champions while it was under debate in the Senate.

Republicans were just as conspicuous in their support of the Civil Rights Act while it was under congressional consideration a year ago. Indeed, its principal architect was Ohio's Representative WILLIAM McCULLOCH, a Republican, who now finds himself chastised by the White House for having suggested a substitute for the President's voting rights bill.

If Mr. Johnson really regards civil rights progress as a national obligation, he should spare no effort to keep it out of the partisan realm. His failure to do so in this instance not only flies in the face of the facts but weakens a civil rights coalition whose vitality it is important to maintain.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in this morning's New York Times an editorial which shared the concern the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB] and I have expressed for the past few weeks over the possibility of a large-scale ground war in the jungles of Vietnam.

The editorial quite correctly pointed out:

To send large numbers of American troops into the jungles to compete with the Vietcong in guerrilla combat would surely mean heavy losses, with doubtful prospect of discouragement to the enemy. A more promising strategy—and one more likely to hold down the toll in American lives—is that of utilizing overwhelming superiority in air and seapower to retain defensible areas along the coast.

The editorial went on to say:

Herein, of course, lies another danger, probably the most serious of all. As the American land force commitment in Vietnam increases, so does the likelihood of Communist military pressure in one or another part of the world where the United States is equally committed—and with better reason. If the United States does become enmeshed in this major land war in southeast Asia, the temptation is obvious to Communist China to exert pressure in Korea, and to the Soviet Union to do the same in Berlin—two tinderbox areas where the American commitment is even deeper than in Vietnam, and the American interest more vital.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues who may have missed this highly significant editorial in the New York Times may have an opportunity to digest its contents, under unanimous consent, I ask that the editorial, entitled, "Build-Up in Vietnam," be placed in the Record at this point.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1965]

BUILD-UP IN VIETNAM

The most recent visit of Secretary of Defense McNamara and Ambassador-designate Lodge to Vietnam has come at a time when the Vietnamese war appears to be escalating to the proportions of a different and more sinister Korea. It comes, too, after both President Johnson and Mr. McNamara have warned the Nation that the limited reserve call-up, extension of enlistments, and increased draft calls might be necessary.

Plainly, the visit marks the failure of one policy and the substitution of another. Until now, the policy the United States has been following in Vietnam was based upon a plan evolved by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who, when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, vigorously opposed large commitment of American combat units to the Asiatic continent.

It is now clear that President Johnson is formulating a Vietnamese policy geared to the concept of committing increasing numbers of ground troops to offensive operations against the Vietcong in the south and to severing the Vietcong supply lines to the north. Public thinking is being prepared for a build-up of American military strength

in Vietnam to something in the neighborhood of 200,000 men, and there is no certainty that even that will prove enough.

Escalation has its own perverse logic; the less effective it proves, the more insistent become the demands to do more and more. This is among the greatest of the dangers against which the United States must guard as it starts down an increasingly perilous path in Asia. The bombing of Communist supply lines in North Vietnam has obviously failed to destroy the combat capabilities of the Vietcong—so now demands are heard for bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and thus vastly increasing the threat of direct intervention by Peiping and Moscow.

It is obviously futile to bemoan the past miscalculations that have contributed to making the present options so somber; the immediate problem is to make sure that new investment in men and materiel is made on terms that offer maximum hope for effectiveness at minimum cost in casualties and minimum risk of extending the war.

To send large numbers of American troops into the jungles to compete with the Vietcong in guerrilla combat would surely mean heavy losses, with doubtful prospect of discouragement to the enemy. A more promising strategy—and one more likely to hold down the toll in American lives—is that of utilizing overwhelming superiority in air and sea power to retain defensible areas along the coast.

The shakiness of the Government of Saigon and the terrible strain the long conflict has put upon the Vietnamese people complicate the difficulties; but they make even more urgent the broad endeavor this country has initiated to develop programs for raising economic standards in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

In the United States, now facing—as in the Berlin crisis—a limited mobilization, there must be immediate attention by Congress and the Pentagon to the serious personnel and materiel deficiencies, not only of the regular services but also of the National Guard and Reserves. The combat effectiveness and readiness of the Armed Forces and their reserves have been impaired for many reasons, including long overstrain and stretching available forces too thinly to cover too many commitments.

Herein, of course, lies another danger, probably the most serious of all. As the American land force commitment in Vietnam increases, so does the likelihood of Communist military pressure in one or another part of the world where the United States is equally committed—and with better reason. If the United States does become enmeshed in this major land war in southeast Asia, the temptation is obvious to Communist China to exert pressure in Korea, and to the Soviet Union to do the same in Berlin—two tinderbox areas where the American commitment is even deeper than in Vietnam, and the American interest more vital.

The Big Thicket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there follows a letter from a constituent of mine who requested that her ideas on the Big Thicket be called to the attention of the House of Representatives:

LA MARQUE, TEX.,
July 6, 1965.

Mr. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you and the entire House of Representatives about a problem that concerns many human lives, "the Big Thicket."

People are walking in there every day and are never seen again. Every day I read where they are draining out sand pits where one child drowned, or convicting a man who raped one small girl. This isn't a sandpit or a madman. This is much worse than either.

Have you any idea of the bodies that would be found in that overgrowth? Of the people who starved, were attacked by wild animals while lost, or perhaps even murdered in those woods. Have you thought of the families of those who disappeared into that trap—and that is what it is.

It may be a tourist attraction, but it is also a tourist trap. If the State of Texas needs tourist attractions that bad, let them build another "Six Flags." But for the sake of every man, woman, and child who travel the roads through that trap, please ask for something to be done, besides putting up signs. Signs do no good.

I would sincerely appreciate it if you could possibly in some way have this letter or my ideas shown or told to the entire House, in fact, I dare you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAVID J. SMITH.

Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

The House had under consideration the conference report on the bill (S. 559) to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the adoption of the conference report on S. 559, the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, because I believe it is an ineffective approach to a most serious problem, and because I feel it will serve to prevent any other effective approach from being pursued either at the Federal, State, or local level.

More than 18 months ago, the Surgeon General of the United States and his Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health unanimously concluded that "Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action."

From this unanimous conclusion, that a serious health hazard is posed by cigarette smoking, arises the responsibility of Congress to take prompt and effective action to warn the American people of the dangers involved.

The health hazard primarily involves two groups: adults who have already acquired the habit of smoking and now find it extremely difficult to withdraw, and our young people who have not yet succumbed to the habit and who thus

may be more easily deterred from taking it up in the first place.

However, statistics show that more than 4,000 young men and women in the United States start smoking every day—so this is the group in which we are vitally concerned, and which offers the greatest potential for success.

As background for consideration of the legislation before us, it should be noted that the Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to its statutory responsibility to protect the interests of America's consuming public, and acting in light of the clear weight of medical evidence and judgment, has issued regulations requiring smoking health hazard warnings on cigarette labels as well as in cigarette advertising.

Both the labeling and advertising warnings were set to take effect on July 1, 1965, but have been held up, in order that Congress would have an opportunity to review the entire question and take appropriate legislative action.

However, the conference report we are considering today requires only that, after January 1, 1966, cigarette packages will bear the rather innocuous and relatively inconspicuous warning: "Caution: Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

But spokesmen from the cigarette industry itself have admitted that a package warning would have little or no effect on the rate of consumption, and one advertising agency executive was even quoted as commenting, "The first thing you learn about labels in this business, is that people do not read them."

And I doubt if many Members here actually expect this label warning to have much real effect, particularly since it would be aimed at those who are already "hooked" by the cigarette habit.

As to cigarette advertising, the conference report provides that "no statement relating to smoking and health shall be required in the advertising of any cigarettes" prior to July 1, 1969—4 years from now.

In other words, the conference report which we are being asked to approve today, not only does not deal with the much more important question of a warning in advertising, it revokes the current order of the Federal Trade Commission requiring such a health hazard warning, and divests the FTC of its lawful function to protect the American consumer for 4 years, by flatly prohibiting it from requiring cigarette advertisers to refer to the well-established relationship between smoking and health.

Inherent, also, in this FTC prohibition is a clear and present threat to the integrity and independence of every Federal regulatory agency with the courage to attempt to fulfill its statutory obligations, without fear or favor, but with the public interest as its guiding principle.

In short, the conference report comes close to being a piece of special interest legislation, designed to protect—not the public health—but rather the economic health of the cigarette industry, by singling it out for special treatment by exempting this one particular industry from the supervisory jurisdiction of the appropriate regulatory authority.

ever. It is possible, of course, that the protracted and unrewarding stand-still in the Dominican Republic may be ended through the formula of a provisional government followed by general elections under OAS supervision. But at best, this will be only a first step in a long and difficult road ahead.

—JAMES BENNETT.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN BUSINESS IN GUARANTEEING EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES—EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the important role—indeed the vital role—that American business plays in the guarantee of equal employment opportunities has again been emphasized by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The Vice President made his remarks at the opening of the "Fair Employment Is Good Business" exhibit at the Department of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Vice President HUMPHREY's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY OPENING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE "FAIR EMPLOYMENT IS GOOD BUSINESS" EXHIBIT, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21, 1965

I am delighted at this chance to visit the equal employment opportunity exhibit, and to pay tribute to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. My thanks to Secretary Connor and the Department of Commerce for making this occasion possible.

A lot has been been written and said about the important task that Chairman Roosevelt and the other Commissioners will perform. It is a challenging job and they will need all the help we can give them.

By "we" I mean all of us in this country. There is no such thing as "the Negro problem" or "the minority group problem." We have an American problem, and all Americans are working today to help solve it.

That is why, Secretary Connor, I was particularly pleased to hear you say that "the business of American business is America."

It has been my experience that the business community is more than willing to volunteer its resources to help solve problems of national concern. We have seen this recently, for instance, in the President's summer youth employment program and in the voluntary steps toward the solution of the balance-of-payments situation.

We have also seen it in Equal Employment Opportunity. In a recent meeting of some of the plans-for-progress companies in San Francisco, I reported the fact that companies with the highest productivity and profits have also provided great leadership in the field of merit employment.

I was also glad, Mr. Secretary, to hear you refer to the need to use education and training programs as a part of equal employment. Not only must we offer equal job opportunities, but we must be sure that all Americans have the chance to build a better life through equal opportunity for education and training. This is another great area where labor, business, and Government work together for the benefit of all.

The headlines that bring us news of unrest ignore the silent accomplishments of countless communities, companies, unions, and schools. The accomplishments of the past give us optimism that we will do still more in the future. Fair employment is good business because it is good sense.

USE OF OPTOMETRISTS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was delighted that the medicare bill recently passed by the Senate made provision for the use of optometric services. Optometrists have long since established themselves as trained and skilled professionals in eye care. More than 70 percent of Americans who wear glasses rely on the services of the optometric profession. Let me emphasize that optometrists are not merely mechanical lens grinders, but educated, dedicated professional men. I think the so-called freedom of choice amendment allowing a recipient of medicare benefits to choose either an ophthalmologist or an optometrist was a wise proviso, and gave long-overdue recognition to the optometric profession.

I was particularly concerned that optometric services would be available to children given medical care under special project grants for the low-income children of school and preschool age. Therefore, I wrote to Secretary Celebrezze requesting that this point be clarified. In his reply to me Secretary Celebrezze said:

It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 833 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care.

And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

I am certain in making this statement Secretary Celebrezze is recognizing the clear intent of Congress, and I am delighted that children will benefit from the healing skills of the modern optometrists. It has too often been tragically demonstrated that the reason that Johnny cannot read is because Johnny cannot see. As a result many optometrists are already participating on a voluntary basis in medical care programs associated with Operation Head Start activities. The medicare bill will make optometric services more easily available to young children. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Celebrezze's letter be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

Washington, D.C., July 16, 1965.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter of July 7, 1965, regarding the provisions in H.R. 8973 relating to the use of optometrists.

The recognition of optometrists was very substantially advanced by a provision in the House-passed bill which requires that under the new medical assistance programs if a State provides eyeglasses the individual shall have free choice between having an examination made by a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or by an optometrist.

The Senate, before passage of the bill, adopted general language applicable to all

titles of the Social Security Act which would accomplish the same result in relation to any services that optometrists are licensed to render. What action the conference committee will take on this amendment I, of course, cannot forecast, but there is no difference in the Senate and House-passed bills in the provision of the medical assistance programs relating to the use of optometrists.

The section 833 relating to special project grants for low-income children of school and preschool age, as you indicate, does not refer explicitly to either eye care or to optometrists. It does require that projects must be comprehensive in nature. This would certainly include eye care. There is no doubt that the recipients of grants under section 833 of title V would have authority to include the services of optometrists in providing eye care. And it would seem certain that a great many, probably a substantial majority, of the eye examinations of children would be made by optometrists.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY C. CELBREZZE,
Secretary.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY AND THE PROBLEM OF VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am encouraged by the statement of 87 American college and university professors, political scientists and others, who have come forth in the past few days to, as they put it, "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam."

As one who has spent his share of time in the academic halls, I spoke here in April, asking for professors and students who agreed with our President and with our Government's policies to come forth and be counted. I asked that they make a true dialog out of the so-called campus debate over the course of affairs in southeast Asia. This group of 87 Americans has. Many others have done likewise.

These distinguished academics have made it clear in their statement of support that they do strongly desire peace and "a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties." And they make it ultimately clear that they firmly believe the President of the United States fully shares this desire.

Realistically, this group has taken into account, however, the limited number of alternatives facing the United States since it was confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam. They have stated their belief that President Johnson and his advisers have chosen wisely from among the choices presented them. And they have rejected what they call the "bizarre political doctrine" that the President of the United States has special obligations to the academic community. I ask unanimous consent that their document of support, with names, and addresses be printed in the Record, along with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday.

There being no objection, the document, names, addresses, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 21, 1965

17075

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS

To dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speaks for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam, we the undersigned feel it necessary to make clear our support for the policies of President Johnson. We do not believe the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been free from errors, but its infallibility is not at issue. At issue are its relevance, realism, and morality. We believe U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

We strongly desire peace in Vietnam and a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties. We regret the involvement of American troops in a foreign war. We believe the President shares these commitments and regrets. We believe in the good faith of his reiterated desire to seek a political settlement of this war through negotiation, any time, anywhere, with any responsible parties.

We ardently support social, political and economic reform in Vietnam and elsewhere, and welcome all efforts to achieve representative institutions, economic opportunity, personal freedom and a higher standard of living for all. We believe that the present Democratic administration has made clear its dedication to progress in Vietnam by its very substantial development program and its promise of massive assistance when the cessation of hostilities makes possible full concentration of the Vietnamese people on the job of development.

We believe that war is a gruesome travesty on civilized decisionmaking and that the war in Vietnam is a hideous burden on the people of that nation. However, we also know—for this is a matter of evidence, not of opinion—that the war in South Vietnam resulted not from a spontaneous outburst of popular unrest, not from American invasion, but from the deliberate exportation by Hanoi of waves of troops trained in the tactics of terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Aggression from the north is not merely a cliché in a propaganda war; it is combat-ready soldiers, trained and equipped by Hanoi, armed with modern weapons, and Mao's strategy for the subjection of a peasant population. We regard it as exceedingly significant that no major population group in South Vietnam supports, or has supported, the Vietcong.

Confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, the U.S. Government had available a limited number of alternatives:

The United States might have sued for peace and met Hanoi's reiterated demand for withdrawal of all American support to South Vietnam. It would thereby have permitted South Vietnam to be integrated into the totalitarian leviathan to the north, and have abandoned tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted totalitarian expansion to liquidation as enemies of a new Communist ruling class.

The United States might have done nothing, and permitted its own forces and those of South Vietnam to be defeated by Hanoi's enlarged forces. This course would have added humiliation to withdrawal, would have enhanced the "paper tiger" image of the United States, as well as have consigned South Vietnam to totalitarianism.

The United States might have launched an all-out war against North Vietnam and destroyed that nation's cities and industrial capacity utterly and precipitously.

The United States might have begun a restrained increase of its military effort, designed to escalate the price of aggression and

enhance the incentives for peaceful settlement.

Among the unsatisfactory and limiting choices available, we believe the President chose wisely. We support his continued efforts to find a political settlement that will achieve peace and freedom for South Vietnam.

Finally, we reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisers have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that all categories of citizens are equal under law, and that neither wealth, nor class, nor expertise entitles a citizen to preferred treatment by his Government.

Ulrich S. Allers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Dean Stephen Bailey, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; Comer Clay, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Joseph Cooper, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; George Demetriou, Director, Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems, Washington, D.C.; Martin Diamond, Department of Political Science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie A. Earle, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John T. Everett, Jr., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Mark F. Ferber, Assistant Professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—The State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Victor C. Ferkiss, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Richard M. Fontera, Department of Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert W. Foster, Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wayne E. Fuller, Professor of History, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Stephen P. Gilbert, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Walter I. Giles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Joseph B. Graus, Department of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Richard Greer, Executive Director, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albermarle Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Ernest S. Griffith, Dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C.

George D. Haimbush, Jr., Associate Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Morton H. Halperin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Haltom, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Donald G. Herzberg, Professor of Political Science, Director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jan Karski, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; James E. Larson, Professor of Political Science, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; J. R. Leguey-Felleux, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Karl H. Lerny, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Michael F. M. Lindsay, Professor, Far Eastern Studies, American

University, Washington, D.C.; Benjamin E. Lippincott, Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Seymour Martin Lipset, Professor, Political Science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; George A. Lipsky, Professor, Political Science and Geography, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Kurt L. London, Professor, International Affairs, Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Charles Burton Marshall, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Neil A. McDonald, Professor, Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; John H. McDonough, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Franz Michael, Professor, International Affairs, Associate Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Warren Miller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; S. D. Myres, Professor, Department of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; William V. O'Brien, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; George R. Osborne, Department of Political Science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert E. Osgood, School of Advanced International Studies of The Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.; Roland I. Perusse, Associate Professor of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Charles W. Procter, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lucian W. Pye, Professor, Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; George H. Quester, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles H. Randall, Jr., Professor of Law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Emmette Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Warren A. Roberts, Professor, Political Science and Economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; A. A. Rommer, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Harold W. Rood, Department of Political Science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Warren Shearer, Professor of Economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; August O. Spain, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Melvin P. Straus, Associate Professor of Government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.

Susan Tallman, Political Analyst, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albemarle Street N.W., Washington, D.C.; Donald Tacheron, Associate Director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.; N. H. Timmons, Professor of History, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Procter Thomson, Professor, Economics and Administration, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Richard L. Walker, Director, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Donald B. Weatherbee, Assistant Professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Clyde Winfield, Chairman, Professor of History, Texas Western College El Paso, Tex.; Gerard F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; I. William Zartman, Associate Professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

17076

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 21, 1965

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 20, 1965]

VIETNAM AND THE PROFESSORS

Despite some impressions to the contrary, not all college and university professors are alienated from the real world or lost in a fog of doctrinaire absurdities. There are important and numerous exceptions. This has been made abundantly clear by a group of 67 of them who have issued an excellent statement strongly supporting what our country is doing in an effort to save south-east Asia from Communist engulfment.

The group—made up chiefly of political scientists, historians and economists with a special understanding of Asian affairs—has left no room for doubt about its endorsement of that effort. Its words deserve to be quoted at some length: "We believe the U.S. policy * * * is consistent with the realities * * * and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam." Accordingly, it is necessary to "dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speak for the entire community" on this issue. "We reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisers have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen."

Well said. So well said, in fact, and so sensibly, that it should be circulated throughout the academic world, at home and abroad, where too much poisonous nonsense is being written and spoken about the fight for freedom in Vietnam.

SOUTH TEXAS PLANNED PARENTHOOD CENTER AT CORPUS CHRISTI ACHIEVES RESULTS WITH GRANT FROM OEO

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the South Texas Planned Parenthood Center in Corpus Christi was the first organization to receive a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of population control. In just 6 months time results have been sufficient to justify an extension of the program.

This is just one more drop in the steadily growing stream of evidence that Federal assistance in dealing with the problems of population growth can yield positive results. The need is clear for a concerted and coordinated Federal-level approach. The distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has been conducting a most informative series of hearings on his bill S. 1676, on which I am honored to be a cosponsor. The bill would create Offices of Population Problems in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to deal with domestic and international aspects of the population explosion. A long list of distinguished witnesses, including former President Eisenhower, have endorsed the bill.

The experience in Corpus Christi shows that positive results can be achieved in combating this problem if we put sufficient resources into the battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington

Post of July 15, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 15, 1965]

FEWER POSTABORTION CASES TREATED IN CORPUS CHRISTI: BIRTHS AMONG POOR ARE REDUCED IN PROJECT AREA

(By Jean M. White)

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., July 14.—The first Federal antipoverty grant for birth-control services among the poor has shown enough results in 6 months to justify an extension of the program, city officials and local supporters feel.

They point to figures showing a continuing drop in postabortion patients—an important indicator in an area with a strong tradition of midwifery among the Spanish-surname families—and in indigent births.

Neighborhood clinics opened with Federal funds have been in operation only 6 months, and it is too early to come up with figures showing direct results.

But doctors and local officials here emphasize they are convinced family-planning advice to avoid unwanted pregnancies will strike at one of the root causes of poverty—the overpopulated family.

Doctors point to figures showing a 41 percent drop in the number of patients treated at Memorial Medical Center after bungled abortions. The sharp decrease came over the last 5 years since a local Planned Parenthood chapter began operation. The Federal funds allowed this program to expand with four satellite neighborhood clinics spotted in the city's poverty strip.

Dr. J. M. Garrett, medical director of the Good Samaritan Clinic, reported postabortion cases dropped from 374 to 220 over the last 5 years at Memorial, which handles mainly charity cases.

Over the same period, births at the hospital dropped 28 percent, Dr. Garrett reported.

Two years ago the obstetrical clinic at the charity hospital had 805 patients during the first 4 months. This year the clinic had 505 patients during the same period.

Corpus Christi was the first city to get approval for a family-planning project as part of its antipoverty community action program. The Federal grant was a modest \$8,500.

Within the last 2 weeks, the Office of Economic Opportunity has given the go-ahead for family-planning programs in four other cities: Austin, Tex.; St. Louis, Buffalo, and Nashville. Earlier, it also granted \$29,424 to Oakland, Calif.

In Corpus Christi, the local Planned Parenthood chapter became a kind of subcontractor to administer the program.

The Federal money has been used to operate four 1-day-a-week clinics in the poor neighborhoods. At the first session, 10 women and 1 man appeared.

The Reverend Reynell M. Parkins, Episcopal priest in charge of St. Martin's Mission, stresses the need for "person-to-person talk."

"You can mail brochures to them, and it is like an illiterate receiving a letter," Father Parkins explains. "You have to sit down in small groups and talk to them."

Word of mouth has proved the most effective means of communication in the West Oso sections of low-income families.

At the Robert L. Moore Community Center yesterday, 15 women watched a film on birth control during the weekly clinic hours. A woman in the front row, with a baby on her lap, said she had come because a neighbor told her.

"I wondered why she hadn't had a baby this spring," she said.

Mrs. Tony Abarca, a former public health nurse, is executive director of the Planned

Parenthood program. She speaks the language and knows the culture of the "Latin" families.

"They will tell me that they had two or three induced abortions," she says. "But they will never name the person because they don't want to cause trouble for the midwife."

The average patient at the Planned Parenthood clinics is 26 years old, has five living children, a third-grade education, and an income of about \$35 a week.

Since the neighborhood centers opened, they have served 187 new patients. Two hundred twenty-eight other patients from the poverty areas have gone to the central clinic, where the main drawing card seems to be a "Pap" smear for cancer detection.

Federal funds cannot be used to give birth-control advice to unwed mothers.

"Unfortunately," says Father Parkins, "the unwed mother can't be helped except at the main clinic. The problem of the mother who has too many children isn't nearly as bad as that of the unmarried woman."

Although Corpus Christi has a large Catholic population, the Roman Catholic Church has offered no public opposition to the program. A family planning grant in Milwaukee has been held up because of Catholic opposition.

"REALITY AND VISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST"; AN ENLIGHTENED VIEW

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a highly informative article by Abba Eban, now Deputy Prime Minister of Israel and from 1950-59 Israel's Ambassador to the United States, appears in the July issue of Foreign Affairs.

Since the situation in the Middle East continues to be tense and is continually a potential danger spot in maintaining peace in that important area, the views contained in this Israeli's statements are worthy of attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Reality and Vision in the Middle East—an Israeli's View," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALITY AND VISION IN THE MIDDLE EAST: AN ISRAELI VIEW

(By Abba Eban)

Since early March the Arab world has been shaken by an angry clash of views about its relations with Israel. Arab thinking on this subject had long been governed by what Whitehead once called inert ideas—that is to say, ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilized or tested or thrown into fresh combinations. This inertia was suddenly broken by two closely related events. The Federal Republic of Germany sought the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel, in conscious rejection of Arab pressure. And the President of Tunisia challenged the official Arab dogma about Israel's place in the Middle East. In statements which had a broad international resonance, Mr. Bourguiba indicated that Israel was a solid and entrenched reality with which the Arab nations would have to come to terms. To dream of sweeping Israel away in a torrent of violence was, in his view, sheer delusion.

The German initiative and the Tunisian pronouncements are, of course, important events. But they do not in themselves explain the volcanic emotion which spread from Cairo across the Arab world. Germany, after all, is not the 1st but the 95th government to establish diplomatic ties with Israel. In none of the 94 previous occasions did Arab